DOCUMENT RESUME

UD 017 820

ED 148 974

AUTHOR Weinberg, Meyer, Ed.
TITLE Research Review of Equal Education No. 1.
INSTITUTION Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill. Center for Equal Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 35p.; Contains occasional small type
JOURNAL CIT Research Review of Equal Education; v1 n1 p1-32 Win 1977

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Aspiration; Educational Economics; *Equal Education; *Historical Reviews; *Integration Effects; Learning Processes; *Literature Reviews; *Research Reviews (Publications); *School Integration; Self Concept; Staff Role

ABSTRACT

This publication aims to present findings of recent research studies, especially relevant to everyday school practices, which affect the provision and realization of equal educational treatment. First, three historical studies which challenge three misconceptions that form the heritage of racial segregation and discrimination in the U.S. are discussed. Several studies address the issue of economics of equality or inter- and intradistrict financial inequalities. Among the issues that are addressed under a section titled the possibilities of school learning is that of autonomous school effects on achievement. Two major studies analyze the subject of desegregation and achievement. One evaluates the federal Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). The research problem was to discover whether the federal dollars were educationally effective. The second study, undertaken by the Educational Testing Service, was concerned with learning how to foster effective desegregation and integration. It is noted that the ratio of studies focusing on the relationship between desegregation, self-concept, and aspirations is very low. Most difficult is the failure of investigators to develop universally recognized measures of self-concept and aspirations. The development of racial prejudice in children is one of the issues discussed in the section on desegregation and student interaction. The last section addresses desegregation and the role of teachers, principals, and administrators in schools in making desegregation work or not. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148974

RESEARCH REVIEW OF EQUAL EDUCATION

Introduction 1

Historical Background 2

Economics of Equality 4

The Possibilities of School Learning 7

Desegregation and Achievement 11

Desegregation, Self-Concept and Aspirations 14

Desegregation and Student Interaction 15

Desegregation and the School Staff 26

Works Cited 30

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD017820

Meyer Weinberg, Editor
Gertrude Martin, Editorial associate
Joyce Mirza, Research assistant
Carol Naughton, Design

Published quarterly by the Center for Equal Education,
School of Education, Northwestern University,
2003 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois 60201.
Phone: 312/492-9465.

Research Review of Equal Education
Volume I, No. 1
~~Winter~~ 1977

US ISSN 912008-14-8
Copyright, 1977
Center for Equal Education

Subscription rates:

1 year	$15.00
2 years	$28.00
3 years	$38.00

(Add $1.50 per year for foreign postage)
Single copy: $4.00 plus postage:
30c domestic 40c foreign

Publication of the **Research Review of Equal Education** is made possible by a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The views expressed herein are solely those of the authors and no endorsement or support from the National Institute of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is intended or should be inferred.

INTRODUCTION

This is the first issue of the *Research Review of Equal Education*. Its goal is to present findings of recent research studies especially relevant to everyday school practices which affect the provision and realization of equal educational treatment. Its method is to place the research in an interpretive framework that permits the reader to see the role of the specific project in the research literature on the subject. An effort is also made to relate the reviewed researches to one another, and to raise unresolved questions leading to further research.

The *Review* is a scholarly, but not a learned, journal. That is, we are deeply interested in the pursuit of new knowledge but unconcerned with the display of that knowledge. We will be seeking the essence of a project more than anything else. At the same time we will avoid simply abstracting or digesting a study.

Our audience, hopefully, will be a broad one. Since we will try to keep tab on a very large body of material, it should be of great interest to researchers as well as practitioners such as teachers, administrators, planners, lawyers and judges, journalists, government officials, and active parents. In general, research since 1975 will form the bulk of materials reviewed. But we reserve the right to review earlier material that for some reason has been overlooked.

All research will be reported under one or more of eleven subject-headings:

1. *Historical Background*

The historical literature of equal education is expanding rapidly. While most of it deals with black children, other minorities are attracting the attention of historians. A special problem is the proliferation of historical accounts which are hardly more than summaries of existing secondary sources. A guide through this literature is especially needed.

2. *The Legal Framework*

Law and education are drawing ever more closely together. This literature is swamping practitioners. A guide is sorely needed.

3. *Economics of Equality*

The subject of inter-district financial inequalities continues to generate a very large literature. Many studies simply document the existence of inequalities; fewer deal with remedies. Another area of interest, intra-district inequalities, has only recently begun to be treated in scholarly studies. Few practitioners seem even to be aware of these studies.

4. *The Possibilities of Learning*

Increasingly, research is demonstrating that poor and minority children are quite capable of mastering the academic tasks of the school. Teachers and administrators, especially, need to know about these studies. Research in other countries is valuable and should be better known in the United States.

5. *Desegregation and Achievement*

With the expansion of desegregation, it is now possible to study many actual cases of learning in desegregated schools. Some of these findings are contrary to earlier ones, based, as they were, on a single desegregated school or classroom.

6. *Desegregation, Self-Concept, and Aspirations*

This is probably the research area of greatest conflict. Many of the findings are contradictory; few of the contradictions have been resolved adequately. Frequently practitioners and researchers are unaware of the dubious quality of much of the existing research.

7. *Desegregation and Student Interaction*

This is one of the most exciting research areas. Traditionally treated by researchers as inert, passive elements in the educative process, students are being revealed as a crucial factor in the success of desegregation. Numerous revealing case studies are waiting to be communicated to school people in need of concrete experiences.

8. *Desegregation and the School Staff*

Studies of the role of administrators are only now beginning to be made in numbers. The indispensable role of educational leadership must become better known. Studies of classroom teachers are yielding valuable lessons, especially those based on actual classroom observation rather than on the tried-and-true questionnaire.

9. *The Educative Role of the Community*

In the last decade or so, the educative potential of the community has come into prominent focus. We need to know more about how organized parents have translated their concerns into concrete school advances. We need to know about such actions in the context of desegregation but also in that of community control.

10. *The Spanish-Speaking Child*

Most studies in this area deal with Mexican American children, and the number of concerned researchers is multiplying. Most of the research revolves around language problems but thorough studies of bilingualism, for example, are still rare. A few studies deal with Puerto Rican children. Only a scattering of preliminary studies of Cuban and other Latin American children has been made.

11. *The Indian American Child*

A generation ago, research on Indian American children was growing rapidly. It was conducted, however, almost solely by Anglo researchers. The past decade has seen the start of a strong effort by Indians to control their own communities, including schools and research in those schools. The resulting research picture departs from the traditional one of a generation ago.

Any single issue of the *Review* may utilize only half the headings. Much depends on the availability of studies. In the next issue or two, for example, we will be reporting on a large number of recent doctoral dissertations dealing with the education of Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and Indian American children. Over a year, a very broad range of research will be covered.

We welcome comments from our readers and encourage them to acquaint us with research we may have missed. Your suggestions for research will be welcomed and transmitted to other readers.

It is a great honor to edit and publish the *Research Review of Equal Education* and to help make real the promise of a first-rate education for every child.

We are most grateful for financial assistance from the National Institute of Education.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In the flood of historical misconceptions that forms the heritage of racial segregation and discrimination in the United States, there are three especially long-lived ones. These are the beliefs that: (1) during the era of slavery, blacks were unable to provide for the education of their children, and therefore, left it up to more enlightened sectors in the white community; (2) after slavery, blacks did not want desegregated schools; and (3) in our own time, racial segregation of students and teachers is caused by population patterns and housing segregation rather than by deliberate action of school authorities.

Three recent histories challenge each of these misconceptions. Ira Berlin,[1] in a study of free Negroes before 1861, finds they were the strongest supporters of private schools for blacks (African schools). White abolitionists helped, but in a lesser way. Schools were most frequently set up by black churches, strongholds of lower- and middle-status blacks: "New church buildings generally in-

1. Ira Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters. The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York: Pantheon, 1974).

cluded schoolrooms, and church laymen were generous in supporting teachers."[2] Public schools in the South were closed to blacks of any class. Carter G. Woodson, the standard authority on black education before the Civil War, stated outright that whites were the dominant factor in the secret schools of the South.[3] Berlin has gone a long way toward restoring the primacy of free Negroes in black education during the era of slavery.

William Vaughn's history of black public education during Reconstruction uncovers a widespread pursuit of non-segregated schooling by Negroes and sustained counter efforts by dominant whites. (Berlin notes: "By the eve of the Civil War, segregation had extended to almost every corner of southern life. Free Negroes . . . were separated from whites in hospitals, theaters, parks, railroad cars, and omnibuses."[4] This well established arrangement was threatened during Reconstruction.) At most, according to Vaughn, only three percent of all southern whites attended freedmen's schools. In New Orleans, about one-third the public schools were non-segregated; but this situation lasted only a few years.

Official opposition to school desegregation was widespread, on several levels. Vaughn refers to "the unwillingness of most congressional Radicals to deal with integration in an honest and forthright manner."[5] Even leading Republicans such as Senator Charles Sumner stood by as several southern states enacted segregation and deprivation for black children, thus contravening congressional enactments forbidding such action. Private philanthropies like the Peabody Fund actively worked for separate schools in the South. On the plantations, segregation was linked with the perpetuation of a system of dependent labor. Thus, the absence of school desegregation in the post-Civil War South expressed the interest, not of blacks, but of important governing forces in the country.

David Tyack is one of the rare historians of American education who approaches the issue of contemporary racism realistically even if not as a central theme. ". . . To say that institutionalized racism, or unequal treatment of the poor, or cultural chauvinism were unconscious or unintentional does not erase their effects on children," writes Tyack. "Urban schools did not create the injustices of American urban life, although they had a systematic part in perpetuating them."[6] Actually, the contents of his book support a view of conscious rather than unconscious actions undergirding racism in schools.

At one point, for example, Tyack notes: "Practically every black voluntary group, almost all black politicians, rated the improvement of educational opportunities near the top of priorities for their people. Yet across the nation many of the whites who controlled systems of public education excluded, segregated, or cheated black pupils."[7] On a matter of great current interest, Tyack writes that "one reason many cities had few black teachers was that superintendents buckled before white protest."[8] Referring to the 1960s, he finds "in the North, urban school boards and school leaders often rejected or sabotaged black demands for mixed schools, even in smaller cities where desegregation was relatively simple to implement."[9] Documentation available elsewhere amply supports these broad generalizations. Yet, the histories of education our present school staffs fed upon say virtually nothing of all this. Nor do funding agencies seem concerned with improving our concept of America's educational history.

---

2. *Ibid.*, p. 304.
3. Carter G. Woodson, *The African Background Outlined Or Handbook for the Study of the Negro* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968; orig., 1936), p. 333.
4. Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters*, p. 326.
5. William Preston Vaughn, *Schools for All. The Blacks and Public Education in the South, 1865-1877* (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1974), pp. ix-x.
6. David B. Tyack, *The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974), p. 12.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 110. 8. *Ibid.*, p. 227. 9. *Ibid.*, p. 280.

ECONOMICS OF EQUALITY

In his last published article, the late economist Vivian Henderson explored the relative importance of race and class for the economic future of American blacks. ". . . The anguish and frustrations in the racial picture," he wrote, "must be viewed within the framework of forces that generated and produced them; the harsh realities of class, slum life, high unemployment, low income, regressive taxes. To these must be added the disproportionate burdens inflicted upon poor people who, as wage earners and consumers, are powerless victims of unprecedented inflation in the economy, and who receive decreasing real benefits from the economic process."[1] Race was still highly relevant but only if considered in relation to economics.

Henderson was interested more in economic class than in the distribution of income as such. Thus, he saw two conflicting developments going on simultaneously among the Negro people as a whole: ". . . Improvements in education, more blacks in middle income groups, a strong and highly concentrated Negro market, all on one side, and on the other side, entrenched poverty, growing rigidity in class differences, unemployment and underemployment, and increasing welfare. The great question is whether the masses of blacks will become a permanent underclass in America."[2] While he did not draw any immediate implications for black education, Henderson stressed the common plight of the poor rather than that of the blacks alone. One might therefore infer he anticipated a future movement of the poor on behalf of schooling designed for other than an "underclass." Henderson urged upon blacks the consideration of concerns common to the poor in our society. Narrowly racial matters, in his view, distracted from the essential interests of black people.

If Henderson's orientation becomes dominant, educators can expect a relative decline in attention among blacks to ethnic or racial values. But in the acendancy would be a broader concern with the economic and political system as well as a greater class consciousness.

As resistance to desegregation has grown among whites, there has been a revival in some quarters of the separate but equal doctrine. Greater financial support for racially separate schools has been put forward as a "trade-off" for desegregation. Political scientist Gary Orfield casts doubt on the prospects for such an exchange: "From the beginning a central problem with the separate but equal doctrine has been that once separation is assured, the dominant white society rarely feels any need to make even a pretense of equality. . . . There is no disposition to increase the resources for ghetto education, even modestly."[3]

Orfield tested his view empirically by analyzing votes on legislative measures to increase federal spending on low-quality ghetto schools as a substitute for desegregation through busing. He found that busing opponents uniformly failed to support such bills. They favored neither desegregation nor improved schools. "The new version of the separate but equal doctrine embraced by a growing number of national leaders and commentators," concludes Orfield, "has the same failings as its pre-1954 cousin. The 'equal' part is just rhetoric. The 'separate' part reflects a cold determined reality."[4]

As legislative policy, the separate but equal doctrine has failed throughout American history. Another facet of the problem, however, retains some plausibility. This relates to whether the positive achievement effect of increased per

1. Vivian W. Henderson, "Race, Economics, and Public Policy," *Integrateducation*, 14 (January-February 1976), p. 15.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
3. Gary Orfield, "Will Separate Be More Equal?", *Integrateducation*, 14 (January-February 1976), p. 5.
4. *Ibid.*

student instructional expenditures is greater in a segregated or desegregated context. Still another aspect of the problem deals with intra-district inequalities, i.e., between schools in the same school district.

Anita Summers and Barbara Wolfe recently studied both facets of the problem. Using Philadelphia data for 1970-1971 or 1971-1972, they studied 1,896 students in 150 schools and found that academic achievement increased "when school resources are applied differentially to low income vs. high income students, black vs. non-black students, and, most clearly, to low-achieving vs. high-achieving students."[5]

Among the most important school resources were class size, size of school, and teacher experience. From elementary through high school, below grade level students tended to gain most through small classes or suffer most from large classes. Black and low-achieving elementary students gained from attending a small school. While highly experienced teachers benefited all children in junior high schools, the study showed, they did not do so in the elementary schools.

Elementary schools with a 40 to 60 percent black enrollment were most favorable to the achievement of black and white students. But in junior high schools, the achievement of black students continued to increase after the school became predominantly black while that of white students dropped after that point.

Whether these findings apply to schools in other cities is somewhat doubtful. Clearly, the 40-60 percent figure reflects the fact that Philadelphia's schools are 62 percent black, and thus a school 40-60 percent black is lower than the average. In other cities, such a range might be far above or below the average. The study provides no explanation of findings that vary between elementary and junior high levels.

The same investigators studied possible inequalities from school to school in Philadelphia in the spending of compensatory education and other funds. Experience varied with academic level. In elementary schools, for example, the comparative numbers of low-income pupils did not account for most of the school-by-school variation in per student federal aid. Much federal aid for disadvantaged children was going to schools with small numbers of such children. In the junior high schools, noted Summers and Wolfe, "remarkably enough, no more federal funds went to schools with high proportions of blacks than low proportion. The relevant coefficient was, in fact, negative!"[6] They dwelled on this finding which they dubbed the "most disturbing" one. On the high school level, compensatory funds do seem to have been spent as intended, i.e., on schools with high concentrations of low-income students.

Allan Mandel's study of four Michigan school systems (Detroit, Flint, Livonia and Beecher) made similar findings.[7] He reported that in some cases intradistrict inequalities were greater than those between school districts. Indeed, he added, classroom by classroom differences within a single school sometimes exceed those existing between entire school districts.

Mandel examined the actual distribution of federal compensatory education funds in Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. Using data from Flint, he discovered that "one dollar in grant money increases expenditure

---

5. Anita A. Summers and Barbara L. Wolfe, *Equality of Educational Opportunity Quantified: A Production Function Approach* (Philadelphia: Department of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 1975), p. 2.
6. Anita A. Summers and Barbara L. Wolfe, *Intradistrict Distribution of School Resources to the Disadvantaged: Evidence for the Courts* (Philadelphia: Department of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 1975), p. 12.
7. Allan S. Mandel, "Resource Distribution Within School Districts," *Integrateducation*, 14 (January-February 1976), p. 8. See, also, Mandel, *Resource Distribution Inside School Districts* (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1975).

a the recipient school by forty-four cents, as fifty-six cents in discretionary expenditure is shifted to other schools." In other words, while the entire compensatory dollar may remain at the recipient school, more than half as much in local funds is shifted to schools presumably not eligible for Title I aid. In effect, therefore, a federal program for educationally disadvantaged children may function as a means of increasing per student expenditures in non-disadvantaged schools.

The great difficulty in ascertaining actual per school expenditures is illustrated by the still unfinished evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). When the research design was established, it was resolved that only actual expenditure data would be collected. Thus, one could analyze the effectiveness of ESAA in terms of realistic expenditure data. In fact, however, the researchers were unable to obtain such data from school districts. Instead, they had to settle for much less. For one thing, they had to depend upon budgeted rather than actual expenditures. For another, they assumed equal expenditures per student.[8] Since a budget consists of nothing more than an authorization to spend, in a strict sense it is not a record of actual expenditures. Thus, it is not possible for the ESAA evaluation to reach real cost figures; by the same token the evaluation cannot properly gauge the educational impact of this financial aid program. The problem is illustrated by Mandel's findings about Flint. If he had not known the total expenditure per student, consisting of local and federal funds, he could not have recognized the lowering of local support to schools receiving "compensatory" federal aid. A further assumption by the ESAA evaluation of equal expenditures per school is also at odds with urban reality.[9]

For what may be the first time a researcher has studied the educational importance of private gifts — mostly by parents — to elementary and secondary schools. Using Los Angeles as an example, J. Michael Fay found a heavy imbalance in educational use of such funds:[10]

> The amounts ranged from $15.02 per Average Daily Attendance (ADA) at an affluent school to 12 cents per ADA at a poverty area school.... What little money accrues to the schools in the poor sample goes to take care of personal welfare items such as shoes, items of clothing, and food; in the affluent sample, virtually 100 percent of it goes to improve the instructional program.

Fay notes that local schools receive such funds in an organized way and that central headquarters has issued official guidelines governing accounting practices for private resources. He contends that "while the state is proceeding to reduce inequalities in the opportunities for education as in the *Serrano* decision, it would be counterproductive for the district to allow private wealth to neutralize the state's efforts."[11]

In all likelihood, the disparity Fay studied has worsened under pressure of the current economic situation. Essential educational services are being cut, especially in schools serving many poor and minority students. Parents of these children are bound to be the persons feeling most the impact of the sagging economy. Under such circumstances the already meager private contribution they can make will all but disappear.

---

8. John E. Coulson and others, *The Second Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation* (Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, July 1976), pp. V, 1-3.
9. See Arthur Wise and Robert Lindquist, "Developments in Education Litigation: Equal Protection," *Journal of Law and Education*, 5 (1976), footnote 80, pp. 19-20.
10. J. Michael Fay, "Private Resources: Another Road to Inequality," *Integrateducation*, 14 (January-February 1976), p. 10. See, also, Fay, *Community Resources in School Finance as Related to Equality of Educational Opportunity in Metropolitan School System* (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974). University Microfilms Order No. 75-11, 480.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

THE POSSIBILITIES OF SCHOOL LEARNING

Over the past two decades or so, numerous researchers and educators have conceived of the school as nearly powerless to exert an independent influence on the education of its students. The classic statement of this view was made by Christopher Jencks and his associates: "Our research suggests....that the character of a school's output depends largely on a single input, namely the characteristics of the entering children. Everything else – the school budget, its policies, the characteristics of the teachers – is either secondary or completely irrelevant."[1] It was not clear whether the declaration was meant to apply to schools as now constituted or to schools however they might be constituted. In either case, the Jencks group's viewpoint was congenial to significant sectors of research and administrative circles. One reason for its seeming reasonableness was the strong stress in American social science research on the salience of social class. It has become almost an article of faith in American education that social class determines academic achievement. If this were truly the case, little room was left for action by the school.

A number of empirical studies have suggested the inadequacy of both viewpoints – social class determinism and school powerlessness. A related subject, purported racial factors in intelligence, has aroused a continuous stream of debate since it plays a role in attempts at explaining the failure of many poor and minority children to learn in the schools.

Bruce Wallace, past president of the Genetics Society of America, has examined the contentions of Arthur R. Jensen, principal proponent of the role of race in intelligence. He concluded: "For Jensen's claim of genetic differences between races in respect to IQ, there is no proof."[2] He continued:[3]

> Proof that a difference in the average phenotypes of two populations is genetic requires a *genetic* test.... Of necessity, a genetic test must take the form illustrated in the chart on DDT-resistance. *Of necessity* because genetics is a science that deals with correlations between a particular phenotype and genetic material (DNA) of known origin; a mere correlation between relatives is not acceptable as proof in genetics.

Wallace also holds that investigations into the racial basis of intelligence are fruitless since "no one has designed an experiment capable of circumventing the influence of human culture, nor will such an experiment be designed."[4] He advocates an end to such studies. Jack Tizard, the president of the British Psychological Society, also contends that "we cannot draw any firm conclusion as to the extent to which genetic differences are responsible for observed differences between groups growing up in different environments."[5]

John Loehlin and associates appraised the research literature on race and intelligence for the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Biological Bases of Social Behavior. They failed to find any compelling evidence of clear-cut racial differences in intelligence: "The majority of the variations in either patterns or levels of ability lie *within* U.S. racial-ethnic and socioeconomic groups, not between them.... It seems clear that the differences among individuals *within* racial-ethnic (and socioeconomic) groups greatly exceed in magnitude the average differences between such groups."[6]

---

1. Christopher Jencks with Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, David Cohen, Herbert Gintis, Barbara Heyns, and Stephan Michelson, *Inequality* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 256.
2. Bruce Wallace, "Genetics and the Great IQ Controversy," *American Biology Teacher*, 37 (January 1975), p. 17.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
5. Jack Tizard, "Race and IQ: The Limits of Probability," *New Community*, 4 (Autumn 1975), p. 375.
6. John C. Loehlin, Gardner Lindzey, and J. N. Spuhler, *Race Differences in Intelligence* (San Francisco: Freeman, 1975), pp. 235, 239.

In his daily newspaper column, Carl Rowan recently expressed a view of the matter which has been expressed increasingly by researchers on race and IQ:[7]

> I'm willing to have the race and IQ tests go on, but I'd like a little time to build up a fair sample. Give me just one generation in which black family income is comparable to that of whites (instead of 56 percent, as is now the case), when blacks can afford the same food, schools, concerts, books; when blacks can enjoy roughly the same neighborhood and other environments as whites. Then, let's see what the IQ measurers find. This will never happen, of course. The racists will say, "We won't give a generation of equality to people we know are not our equals."

A parallel approach is taken by Wallace.[8]

Over the past five years, scholarly proponents of the racial-intelligence thesis seem to have diminished in number. On the critical substantive issue — genetic evidence — there has been a virtually complete failure to produce any. Ordinarily, scientific questions with such a poor record of substantiation would disappear from serious consideration. The racial-inferiority argument persists; however, its source of strength lies more in the political realm than in the arena of scientific evidence. The political movement against racism has also grown in strength, and this, too, has contributed to the recent relative decline in racial-inferiority arguments.

Three recent studies bear directly on the issue of autonomous school effects on achievement. Two of them are of exceptional interest since they were conducted in two of the largest cities in the United States, Los Angeles and Philadelphia.

Rand studied low income sixth graders in twenty inner-city, predominantly minority Los Angeles schools. All the schools showed a large and often a consistent gain in standardized reading percentile scores during 1972 - 1975, contrary to city-wide sixth graders whose average percentile rank actually declined over the same period. The research problem was to account for the successful schools and, perhaps by inference, the unsuccessful ones.

The high scoring schools were characterized by:[9]

1. Teacher confidence in the learning capacity of their students
2. An encouraging classroom climate
3. A superior reading program
4. Appropriate implementation strategies
5. Alert and supportive principals

The Rand team estimated the overall impact of superior school reading practices on students: "...We estimate that exposing the average student in our sample to all of the approaches found to be effective would have resulted in a 10 to 20 point percentile gain for that student over the course of the sixth grade, instead of the decline of 3 percentile points that actually occurred."[10]

Joseph Payne's study of reading scores in schools in poverty areas of Los Angeles indicates that these twenty schools were by no means typical. He found it a near certainty that schools enrolling a majority of poor students would exhibit very low reading scores.[11]

---

7. Carl T. Rowan, "Cheers! Blacks Are Not Inferior After All," *Chicago Daily News*, February 28, 1976. See also Lee J. Cronbach, "Five Decades of Public Controversy over Mental Testing," *American Psychologist*, 30 (1975), p. 2.
8. Wallace, "Genetics and the Great IQ Controversy," p. 13.
9. David Armor and others, *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools* (Santa Monica, California: Rand, August 1976), pp. 32-37.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
11. Joseph F. Payne, "Race, Reading, and Poverty in Los Angeles," *Integrateducation*, 9 (November-December 1971), pp. 15-21.

A puzzling feature of the Rand study is that its findings apply principally to black students in the twenty schools. The researchers record "....our inability to identify statistically significant relationships between specific classroom inputs and the reading achievement of Mexican-American children...."[12] No explanation is offered. Since, however, Mexican Americans outnumber blacks in the Los Angeles schools, the Rand study failed to solve the larger part of its research problem. Why do seemingly "good" reading programs and practices fail to work for Mexican Americans in high-scoring as well as in low-scoring schools in Los Angeles?

As we saw earlier ("Economics of Equality"), Summers and Wolfe found that school resources in Philadelphia affected academic achievement significantly. One should keep in mind not only factors that "cost" money, such as smaller class size. School climate also affects achievement. Summers and Wolfe deal with the positive effect of mixed-ability classes on achievement, although this effect varied between elementary and junior high schools.

Anthony Boardman and associates, in a reexamination of the 1965 Coleman data, found that "both the home and the school are important for all achievements, especially verbal and general informational."[13] They mentioned teachers' verbal ability, smaller class size, teacher experience and even school facilities. "...Whites and Orientals," note the researchers, "perform best on all tests of achievement. Nevertheless, the twelve to fourteen mark differential between the other minority groups and whites in verbal achievement narrows to four or five marks when all other factors are controlled by inclusion."[14]

A long term study of the progress of preschool children as they move into higher grades has been underway since 1968. It is being conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) and is known formally as "Disadvantaged Children and Their First School Experiences." For most of the project its director has been Virginia C. Shipman. While no overall report has yet been issued, a number of reports on specific topics are available. Following are comments on various of these special reports available at this point to the *Research Review of Equal Education*.

At one time or another four sites were involved: Lee County, Alabama; St. Louis, Missouri; Portland, Oregon; and Trenton, New Jersey. The racial composition of the 1,875 children was: 62.4 percent black; 36.6 percent white; and 1.0 percent other. Their families were predominantly low income. The black children were more uniformly poor than were the white children. Early in 1969 most ranged in age from 3 years and 9 months to 4 years and 8 months.

The most persistent theme in all the reports is the great variety in intellectual performance found among these children of similar social circumstance. A 1970 report concluded:[15]

> The most compelling finding...is the wide range of individual differences exhibited in this relatively restricted sample. Low-income youngsters are not a homogeneous group....Youngsters from low-income families span a much wider range of cognitive, personal-social, perceptual, and physical functioning than some would have us believe.

---

12. Armor and others, *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program*, p. 32.
13. Anthony E. Boardman, Otto A. Davis, and Peggy R. Sanday, *A Simultaneous Equations Model of the Educational Process: The Coleman Data with An Emphasis Upon Achievement in 1973 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association*, Social Statistics Section, p. 65.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Preliminary Description of the Initial Sample Prior to School Enrollment*, vol. 1 (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, August 1970), p. 222 (emphasis in original).

Five years later, the same point was still considered important:[16]

> The substantial variation within this population on measures of achievement motivation and cognitive perceptual performance, even within sex and geographic categories, demonstrates the folly of considering low-income black children as a homogeneous group.

While the span of socioeconomic status among children's families was quite narrow, status — as measured by mother's education — turned out not to be related to the children's academic progress. "Cognitive level prior to preschool entry," wrote Walter Emmerich, "consistently influenced the child's personal-social behaviors, while socioeconomic background....did not."[17]

As the children progressed through the early years of grade school, investigators tracked their development. One thing became clear: these children were not "another breed", so to speak. They differed from other children in rate, not course, of development. Growing up in advantaged homes gives children a *head start,* literally, and no more. William Ward points out: "The young child is not lacking in self-regulatory ability.... What he lacks is an understanding that it is to his advantage to bring this ability to bear in his test-taking performance."[18]

Shipman underscores the factor of experience:[19]

> The less clearly defined general ability dimension which was found for the younger, less "academically" prepared, and economically poorer children in the sample may reflect both greater susceptibility to situational determinants and less generalizable processing skills. That is, they may have been less able to apply what they know...With continued practice and experience, cognitive mechanisms may come into play that will give order and consistency to these behaviors.

The experience factor was held to be especially critical for developing the cognitive use of language.

A final factor worth noting is the great care taken by the ETS researchers to test children when they were at their best:[20]

> The total testing climate was geared toward making the child more comfortable. Time was taken to establish rapport (in some cases, several days), relatively familiar testing rooms in church schools were used, and the tasks were administered by local testers whose dialect and race (wherever possible) were similar to the child's. All of these factors contributed to a congenial and supportive atmosphere. In addition, we attempted to schedule so that each mother could accompany her child on the first testing day. These test conditions, differing as they do from the rigidities of non-essential components of standardized practice, may have contributed substantially to the level of competency observed, as well as to the validity and reliability of measurement.

---

16. Brent Bridgeman and Virginia C. Shipman with others, *Predictive Value of Measures of Self-Esteem and Achievement Motivation in Four- to Nine-Year Old Low-Income Children* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, November 1975), p. 87.
17. Walter Emmerich, *Preschool Personal-Social Behaviors: Relationships with Socioeconomic Status, Cognitive Skills, and Tempo* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, August 1973), p. 29.
18. William C. Ward, *Development of Self-Regulatory Behaviors* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, May 1973), p. 61.
19. Virginia C. Shipman and others, *Structure and Development of Cognitive Competencies and Styles Prior to School Entry* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, December 1971), pp. 108-09. See also, Lynn Gilbert and Virginia C. Shipman, "Preschool Inventory," Virginia C. Shipman (ed.), *Technical Report Series* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, December 1972), pp. 350-52.
20. Shipman (ed.), *Technical Report Series*, p. 22.

Alfred Binet, the founder of the modern intelligence test, would have been pleased by this arrangement as he advocated the same testing approach. This emphasis has been conceptualized more recently by the Israeli psychologist, Reuven Feuerstein[21] in his work with Jewish immigrant children from North Africa and the Middle East.

A very recent study by Garlie Forehand and associates raises some thoughtful questions about the autonomous role of the school. They suggest "caution in attributing poor educational outcomes to 'student background'. When student background affects both the student's own attitudes and achievement *and also* the nature and quality of the education that the student receives, the school must share responsibility for poor outcomes."[22] This study is discussed further on pp. 12 and 13.

DESEGREGATION AND ACHIEVEMENT

Two major studies — one just completed, the other soon to be completed — are available for analysis.

The first study is being conducted by the System Development Corporation (SDC) and is an evaluation of the federal Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). Under the law, federal funds were provided to help school districts carry out a desegregation plan (the Basic program) or to help predominantly minority districts improve the quality of their educational services (the Pilot program). The research problem is to discover whether the federal dollars were educationally effective. A three-year research period was established, from 1973-1974 to 1975-1976. So far, reports on the first two years have been released.

The study was plagued by a fatal weakness not of its own making. Schools receiving ESAA funds were matched with comparable schools in the same district which did not receive such funds. Presumably, if the ESAA grants were sizable enough, certain features would emerge that favored the ESAA schools over the non-ESAA schools. In fact, however, the non-ESAA schools "tended not only to have nearly as much money as the. . . . [ESAA] schools, but also to spend that money for similar kinds of program activities." It also turned out that neither group of schools followed any really innovative technique or program.[1] In effect, two groups of similar schools were being tested for differences.

The evaluation was, however, far from a complete loss. Certain important findings were derived from a comparison of Basic and Pilot schools, and from an in-depth study of thirty elementary and high schools. Also, SDC tried to ascertain what practices helped academic achievement in either ESAA schools or non-ESAA schools.

Achievement scores of individual students who had been in a Pilot school over two years underwent "considerable growth."[2] Comparable students in Basic schools exhibited "a consistent pattern of positive differences. . . ." This did not happen in Basic high schools but, in the tenth and eleventh grades in these schools, it was found that "larger reading gains were made by students in districts

21. See Feuerstein in Lee Cronbach and P. J. D. Drenth (eds.), *Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation* (The Hague: Mouton, 1972), p. 268.
22. Garlie A. Forehand, Marjorie Ragosta, and Donald A. Rock, *Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, July 1976), p. iv.

1. John E. Coulson and others, *The First Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation* (Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, September 15, 1975), p. VIII-1.
2. John E. Coulson and others, *The Second Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation* (Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, July 1976), p. IX-14.

that undertook more activities designed to facilitate and support school desegregation."[3] Presumably, such an atmosphere encouraged minority children to learn more readily. When individual students were grouped by schools and studied over two years, another achievement-related finding emerged. "The strongest relationship in these data was between the teacher's expectations for the student ...and the reading outcome..."[4] The SDC researchers emphasize that no significant achievement differences were found between ESAA and non-ESAA schools as such.

At least as significant as the main study is an in-depth study that was made of twenty-four elementary schools. Fifteen were "successful", i.e., at least two grades in each school recorded a rise in national percentile ranks in reading or mathematics. Nine were "unsuccessful." Observers visited each of the schools for a period of two weeks; they sat in individual classrooms and interviewed teachers and administrators.

In the in-depth study, reading and mathematics scores were maximized by: (1) the use of paid parent aides in the classroom; (2) the utilization of behavioral or other objectives in classroom instruction; and (3) allocation of major resources per pupil to employ remedial specialists in the classroom. "The importance of this study's findings," according to Jean Wellisch, "lies in the fact that school program characteristics do appear to make a difference in student achievement."[5] If so, improvements in achievement are well within the realm of schools.

Further discussion of the ESAA study, with implications for academic achievement, can be found on p. 27.

A second major desegregation study was undertaken by the Educational Testing Service. About 200 elementary and high schools were covered. A survey in 1974 was repeated on a smaller scale the following year. Site visits to 48 schools were made the earlier year and to 43 of these schools the next year. Fifth- and tenth-graders were tested; teachers, principals, and counselors filled out questionnaires; some were interviewed during site visits.

The three-year long ETS study is preeminently practical. It is concerned with learning how to foster effective desegregation and integration rather than spinning on about the pros and cons of integration and segregation. Specifically, the researchers sought out specific school conditions that were demonstrably effective. Then, they asked school personnel in those real situations to suggest to others how integration might best be carried out.

Since so very few applied studies in integration have been made — itself a topic worth studying! — care should be taken in evaluating such studies. Unlike most theoretical inquiries, the ETS project did not analyze a broad range of experiences of integration. Instead, it compared in great detail very successful instances of integration with ones that had been moderately successful. So unaccustomed are we to such studies that they are sometimes termed "biased" because they do not discuss the "failures." (Such was the hostile reception by some to a recent report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. It sought to demonstrate that desegregation was feasible and selected actual cases to test the proposition. The goal was practical — i.e., to show that desegregation "worked." This can be refuted only by demonstrating that the specific cases chosen by the Commission do not, in fact, illustrate what they are alleged to illustrate.)

---

3. *Ibid.*, p. 3-15.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 2-
5. Jean B. Wellisch and others, *An In-Depth Study of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Schools: 1974-1975* (Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, July 1976), p. 12.
6. Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock, *Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation*, p. 39.

In the ETS study, successful integration is measured in terms of academic achievement and race relations. School practices that encourage good race relations were found to be related to conditions which foster academic growth. Where blacks were learning, so were whites, especially in elementary schools. In high schools, "achievement is significantly related to perception of school fairness."[6]

The ETS researchers did not identify any school factor that, of itself, was directly related to achievement differences. Instead, various school factors, interacting with one another, significantly affected achievement. (A number of these interactions touch on material discussed under separate headings, so they are discussed under those headings.) Especially in an applied study, the way a practice is implemented can be at least as important as which practice is implemented.[7]

A small research study which, unlike the ETS approach, measured only the effect of the racial composition of schools upon academic achievement, was carried out by Christopher Jencks and Marsha Brown. Using data gathered in 1965 from 359 northern elementary and 154 northern high schools for the Coleman Report, the researchers conclude that "racially balanced elementary schools may have modest positive effects on both black and white test scores." Most specifically:[8]

> On the average attending a predominantly white elementary school boosted a black student's test scores by 0.215 standard deviations. If all blacks gained this much relative to white norms between first and sixth grades, the test score gap between blacks and whites would fall by 21 percent.

Proponents of desegregation might welcome this finding but they could not be greatly helped by it. The research does not specify any factors originating in the schools that might account for the finding. There is no discussion of teaching strategies, school or classroom climates, or any of a myriad of factors that might be at work. The study's finding can only serve as the beginning of an inquiry rather than as a conclusion. It should be kept in mind that the Jencks-Brown data are not illustrative of the desegregation process; they were collected at one time, nearly a dozen years ago.

The National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) used a similar approach in its study of changes in science achievement. It found that in the Southeast, the country's most desegregated area, nine-year-old black students had improved in science achievement over the period 1969-70 to 1972-73. Following is a compilation of the changes, by race and region, for these years:[9]

Differences in Science Achievement: Race, Age, and Region
1969-70 to 1972-73
(in percent)

	Blacks	*Whites*
Southeast		
9 years	+2.8	—1.6
13 years	—1.1	—1.2
17 years	—1.2	—1.2
Northeast, Central, Western		
9 years	—3.5	—1.3
13 years	—5.1	—1.8
17 years	—2.5	—3.0

7. See the good advice in Daniel F. Luecke and Noel F. McGinn, "Regression Analyses and Education Production Functions: Can They Be Trusted?" *Harvard Educational Review*, 45 (August 1975), pp. 347-48.
8. Christopher Jencks and Marsha Brown, "The Effects of Desegregation on Student Achievement: Some New Evidence From the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey," *Sociology of Education*, 48 (Winter 1975), pp. 136-37.
9. National Assessment of Educational Progress, *Science Achievement: Racial and Regional Trends, 1969-73* (Denver: Education Commission of the States, March 1976), p. 5.

Southeastern blacks as a whole fared considerably better than their northern peers who registered comparatively large declines.

NAEP also studied achievement changes in relation to school racial composition. As the table indicates, black 17-year-olds in the Southeast dropped in achievement. Those, however, who attended schools that were 10 to 39 percent white showed a gain rather than a drop.[10] Nine-year old blacks in the North dropped 3.5 percent, as the table shows. On the other hand, those attending up to 2.5 percent white schools in 1972-73 gained 2.5 percentage points over 1969-70.[11]

The NAEP survey will reassure those who feared desegregation in the South would bring about a fall in academic achievement. It is not possible, however, to ascribe the southern 9-year olds' gain to desegregation. Since desegregation brought about an improvement in the material quality of black education in the South and compensatory education has made headway there, it is at least plausible to give the credit for science-knowledge improvement to desegregation. On the other hand, as in the case of the Jencks-Brown study, one does not know just what specific factors might have been operative to have produced the improvement. Clearly, it could not have been merely changes in racial ratios.

"The pressing need now," writes Nancy St. John, "is to discover the school conditions under which the benefits of mixed schooling are maximized and its hardships minimized."[12] Preoccupation with racial ratios alone does not seem an efficient way of getting at those "school conditions" of which St. John speaks.

DESEGREGATION, SELF-CONCEPT AND ASPIRATIONS

This section deals with a subject that is as elusive as it is important. It is especially advisable, therefore, that the reader reserve several grains of salt when reading of the studies. Actually, the ratio of studies to assertions in this subject area is one of the lowest in the literature. Most difficult is the failure of investigators to develop universally recognized measures of self-concept and aspirations.

In mid-1974, the ETS study, "Disadvantaged Children and Their First School Experiences", was in its sixth year. Over a thousand children in three sites had been under scrutiny over those years.

During the period when most of the children were four to six years old, their self-esteem scores had been high. By third grade, however, their scores were "well below ceiling levels."[1] The researchers comment that in view of the drop in self-esteem, "it is important for teachers to be aware of their behaviors which could cause (the) reductions...."[2] During first grade, black children from poorer families apparently were enjoying school and seemed motivated toward achievement. Yet, the same children were not mastering basic skills in first grade. "..... While developing positive attitudes may be necessary for school success," write the researchers, "it is obviously not sufficient; teachers must also provide adequate instruction on the appropriate task-related behaviors. Also, the school must reinforce and sustain such interest and motivation."[3]

---

10. *Ibid.*, p. 21. 11. *Ibid.*
12. Nancy H. St. John, *School Desegregation Outcomes for Children* (New York: Wiley, 1975), p. 122.

1. Bridgeman and Shipman with others, *Predictive Value of Measures of Self-Esteem and Achievement Motivation*, p. 73.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 78.

A similar finding was made by Ronald Marx and Philip Winne in their study of black fifth and sixth graders' self-concept in relation to achievement: "The goal of enhancing self-concept is admirable and should be pursued for its own sake. However, the expectation of increased achievement as a direct result of attempts to enhance self-concept in black, lower SES children in grades five and six seems unwarranted."[4] Unexpectedly, it was found that a lower social self-concept went along with higher academic achievement. Marx and Winne guess that this might reflect the fact that in some schools children who fail to gain social acceptance turn to academic studies as a substitute.

Psychiatrist Alvin Poussaint has commented on achievement in relation to racial self-concept:[5]

> But there is another dimension of self-concept that we often neglect. The question is not just "Who am I," or "What am I," but "What shall I become?" ....If you just hang up signs that say, "Black is beautiful," children won't learn the skills needed to participate fully in society and to feel that they are worthwhile. All of the "Black is Beautiful" posters, sloganeering and stories in the world will not have the desired effects.

Poussaint is speaking of the danger inherent in self-enhancing activities which regard such enhancement as an acceptable substitute for substantive achievement. As Marx and Winne point out, it may not even be adequate preparation for achievement.

DESEGREGATION AND STUDENT INTERACTION

More people of different races interact in schools than in any other area of American life, except at work. Only recently, however, have researchers begun to dig deeply into these experiences. These inquiries are unevenly distributed among all the questions that need exploring. Some lines of research are becoming well established; others are in the pioneer stage. And then there is a great storehouse of commonsense knowledge on the subject, all of it worth examining but little worth retaining. Much racism has crept into our everyday conceptions of racial interactions.

In this section we will examine individual and groups of studies covering the following topics: (1) the development of racial prejudice in young children; (2) the Indianapolis studies of racial interaction in the high schools of that city; (3) the ETS study of desegregation, already discussed above; (4) a series of studies of specific schools in several cities; and (5) a review of the social psychological literature of intergroup contact.

Phyllis Katz, an American psychologist, is perhaps the most active researcher into racial attitudes of young children. She has also done the most extensive analysis of research in the field. Racial attitudes, she finds, begin to develop during nursery school days. Even at that early age, black children seem more sensitive to racial cues. "It would appear," Katz writes, "that social scientists sometimes try to chase butterflies with meat axes."[1] One such "meat axe" is a once widely-held theory that racial attitudes in children arise out of personal maladjustment. Katz

4. Ronald W. Marx and Philip H. Winne, "Self-Concept and Achievement: Implications for Educational Programs," *Integrateducation*, 13 (January-February 1975), p. 31.
5. Alvin Poussaint, "New Values Challenge Old Assumptions," *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin*, 7 (1976), pp. 2-3.

1. Phyllis A. Katz, "The Acquisition of Racial Attitudes in Children," *in* Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism* (New York: Pergamon, 1976), p. 136.

argues, however, that "large numbers of children express racial prejudice but do not seem to be maladjusted in other areas."[2] While a sizeable number of very young black children express a desire to be white, very few whites seek to be black, thus suggesting to Katz "that differential status evaluations must get communicated to children at the outset."[3]

Katz warns against overemphasizing the preschool years. She theorizes that the development of full-scale racial attitudes may occupy the first ten years or so of a child's life. If this is true, then "it is clear that a child's school experiences may be extremely important in the elaboration of racial attitudes."[4] The early origin of prejudice thus suggests that "the age for integration may have to be much earlier than the school years to have any substantial impact."[5] At the same time, the extension of racial-attitude formation into the grades requires that the school accept a greater responsibility to lessen prejudice.

How significant is the occasional research finding that any relationship between interracial contact and children's attitudes is inconclusive? To Katz such a finding "suggests the need for additional attitude intervention techniques, not the diminution of desegregation efforts. Desegregation may be a necessary but not a sufficient condition."[6] A new stance by the schools is critical for the development of nonracist attitudes:[7]

> At this particular moment in history, many school administrators shy away, ostrich-like, from any mention of race, much in the same way as they do with regard to sex education. . . . Until schools are willing to come to terms with their responsibility in this area, the chances for developing effective attitude change programs seem minimal.

What are the prospects, even if schools do make such efforts? "Evidence to date," Katz concludes, "suggests no good reasons to why the twig we bend so successfully can't be straightened."[8]

It is the "bending" of the twig that occupies the attention of British psychologist Alfred Davey. Along with Katz, he searches for the origins of racial prejudice not in some pathological process but in the ordinary run of child development. The young prejudiced child is engaging in an "essentially rational process of trying to make sense of the world."[9] Categorization of people into "we" and "they" simplifies the social world and helps establish an identity for the child. That simplification and identification take the particular direction they do results from the culture which imposes upon the children a value structure shored up by rewards and punishments. "We must," writes Davey, "by legal, political, and educational means, eradicate or change the conditions which make it necessary for that particular system of social categorization to be taught or learned."[10]

Yakov Epstein and associates investigated the relationship of cleanliness to race prejudice among second, third, and fourth graders in an interracial school in New York City. Ninety-one percent of the sixty white and fifty-six native-born black children identified their race correctly. When asked to designate the classmates they preferred, both black and white tended to select children of their own race. When shown pictures of black and white children, both of whom appeared

---

2. *Ibid.*, p. 137. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 148.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 150. 5. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
6. Phyllis A. Katz, "Attitude Change in Children: Can the Twig Be Straightened?" in Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, p. 226.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 235.
8. *Ibid.*
9. Alfred G. Davey, "The Growth of Prejudice in Young Children," *Patterns of Prejudice*, 8 (May-June 1974), p. 17.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

clean, own-race choices tended to be made. When, however, the pictured own-race child appeared to be dirty, an other-race choice tended to be made. White children seemed to be more concerned than the black children with cleanliness.

The researchers also investigated the accuracy of perception of the other race's preferences. They found it noteworthy that "whereas the actual responses of children of both races tend to show a high degree of favorability to members of the opposite race, children perceive the norms of the other group to be highly ethnocentric. . . . ."[11] Epstein and associates call for correction of the inaccurate perception as a way of improving race relations. The presence of such misperception is by no means unknown in studies of adults. Epstein's study is one of the few which explores it among young children within the age range hypothesized by Katz as crucial for formation of racial prejudice.

In 1970 a group of researchers at Purdue University undertook the largest scale empirical investigation yet of student interracial contact. It involved the eleven high schools of Indianapolis, Indiana and was conducted with the fullest cooperation of school authorities. Several specialized reports have been published, but none in printed form. (This is one reason why the findings of this study are so little known. Another reason probably is the generally positive findings with respect to desegregation. Good news about desegregation travels through the popular press and learned journals much more slowly than bad news.)

Four separate reports by the Purdue group will be discussed.

In the first, interracial perceptions are investigated. Subjects were sixty black and sixty white students in each class (i.e., freshmen, sophomores, etc.) at each of eleven schools. A total of more than 100 interviews were conducted. It should be noted that while no formal desegregation program had occurred in Indianapolis, racial composition at the high schools ranged from nearly all-white to nearly all-black.

What were the perceptions of black and white students? In summary:[12]

> The biggest difference in blacks' perception of the two races is seen on the item "act superior" or "stuck up." Blacks generally saw a higher proportion of whites . . . acting in this way. Whites were also seen as somewhat more likely than blacks to "expect special privileges for themselves in school" and slightly more "loud and noisy in school."
>
> Specifically, whites perceived much larger proportions of black schoolmates as persons who: (a) talk and act in a crude or coarse way; (b) are loud and noisy in school; (c) don't obey some school rules; (d) expect special privileges for themselves in school; and (e) act superior or "stuck up."

With regard to perceptions about concrete actions of one or another group, at least to some extent most had a factual basis. Most inaccurate were the perceptions of subjective feelings. An example of the latter was the erroneous white perception "that fewer black than white students want to get good grades and go to college."[13] Neither racial group was found to be essentially more accurate or inaccurate in perception than the other.

In the schools as a whole, fewer than one out of four blacks regarded most whites in their school as being friendly towards blacks. At the same time, whites were not regarded as totally unfriendly.

---

11. Yakov M. Epstein, Edward Krupat, and Constance Obudho, "Clean Is Beautiful: Identification and Preference as a Function of Race and Cleanliness," *Journal of Social Issues*, 32, No. 2 (1976), pp. 117-18.
12. Martin Patchen, James D. Davidson, and Gerhard Hofmann, *Inter-Racial Perceptions Among High School Students* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, May 1974), p. 15.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

A second Purdue report concerns friendship relations of black and white students. Samples of sixty black and sixty white students were drawn from ten schools. School racial composition ranged from 8.7 to 71.2 percent non-white with a median of 36 percent.

Of all the factors studied, the strongest influence on striking up interracial friendships is the amount of interracial contact students have had before entering high school. These include but are not limited to school contacts. Inside the high school, an important factor turned out to be the opportunity for interracial contact in classrooms and elsewhere in the school. Still another factor in stimulating interracial friendship was a perception that one's race-peers were favorable to interracial interaction. So, also, was a perception that both blacks and whites shared common beliefs about race. And, finally, a general liking of other-race students helped give rise to interracial friendships.

Except for the factor of pre-high school contacts, the high school itself is capable of influencing each of the foregoing factors. (In fact even the pre-high school factor can be influenced somewhat in terms of engendering beneficial racial attitudes at home wherever high school students have younger siblings who will attend the high school later on.)

The Purdue group notes three ways in which their second study suggests novel implications for interracial friendship. One is the observation that many cross-race friendships were also cross-class friendships: "...Relative socioeconomic status make(s) no significant contribution to the prediction of interracial friendship... Neither relative socioeconomic status nor perceptions of socioeconomic status affected our measure of friendship behavior to a significant degree."[14] This study is a rare empirical test of the oft-repeated statement that school friendships will not cross social-class boundaries. It suggests the need for more empirical tests of this commonplace belief. Perhaps the stress on within-class social interaction functions less as a description of reality and more as an ideological prescription.

Another important implication arises from the study's findings that interracial friendship is likelier when opportunities for interracial contact are maximized. At first glance this way seems to be a tautology since, obviously, a friendship cannot be struck up in the absence of an opportunity to interact. This study's finding, however, says more than that. It implies that the more the merrier. That is, the frequency of interracial friendship can be increased by enlarging the opportunities for such friendships to occur. A practical implication of this finding is that the school, by having more heterogeneous classes and by encouraging interracial participation in extra-curricular activities, will probably heighten the occurrence of interracial friendship. This view goes far beyond the conception of interracial friendship as a matter of mysterious sparks which may or may not be given off by two individuals, heaven knows why or why not.

A third implication concerns the finding that one's own peer-group approval of interracial friendship is critical. This was found to be true of both blacks and whites. Thus, one way to better relations among both groups lies through collective self-examination by each. Since racial beliefs, whatever else may be true of them, are subject to discussion, wise school leadership will encourage one-race groups of students to clarify their own beliefs by meeting with other-race groups. Such an emphasis places a premium upon rational thought and is welcome if for that reason alone.

---

14. Gerhard Hofmann, Martin Patchen, and James D. Davidson, *Social Determinants of Friendship Relations Between Black and White Adolescents* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, 1975), pp. 20, 35.

A third Purdue study centers on changes in student opinions on racial matters. Other related topics are also dealt with in this study. One such topic is avoidance, i.e., a deliberate effort to reduce one's interracial contact. Let us examine this before going on to opinion change.

Not unexpectedly, students who, before high schools, were unfavorable to other-race persons tended to avoid them in high school. And students who were generally aggressive in their own-race group also tended to avoid students of another race. Family racial attitudes are important, too: the more favorable they were, the less avoidance occurred. Very little avoidance, it was found, depended on past or present interracial contacts. In other words, avoidance thrives on negative attitudes, expectations, and, at times, on fears. Typically, it does not result from unpleasant or other types of interracial interaction. This is both dismaying and hopeful: dismaying, because it suggests avoidance is not based on actual experience; hopeful, because racial attitudes can be discussed and changed. Evidence is growing that high school-age students are not fixed forever in their racial attitudes.

Under what circumstances did opinions on racial matters change? The researchers write:[15]

> For students of both races, a positive racial attitude by the student's family is the best predictor of positive opinion change. Less ethnocentrism among same-race schoolmates also contributes to more positive opinion change; this effect is especially strong among white students.

White opinions tended to become a little less positive when whites' SES was higher than that of blacks. SES difference did not affect black opinion change one way or the other. Those students who began the year with positive opinions did not necessarily grow more positive. They did, however, develop more interracial behavior. (They *act* more positive but don't verbalize it.)

Another favorable circumstance for positive opinion change was the existence of opportunities for cooperative work by black and white students:[16]

> The results provide some support for the general proposition that those of different groups will get along best in circumstances where they aid, rather than hinder, each other in pursuit of important goals. Results showing participation in school activities makes a strong contribution to friendly interracial contact also are consistent with this proposition since many activities involve interracial cooperation toward common goals.

The researchers repeat their earlier caution that socioeconomic differences between blacks and whites are not an obstacle to positive opinion change. (Much of the writing to the contrary is based on theoretical deduction and rarified laboratory experiments. It will be interesting to see if additional empirical research in schools will support or contravene these writings.)

One implication of this Purdue study is to question the influential model of opinion change whereby efforts are made to bring about a wholesale attitude or personality change as a necessary prerequisite to change in racial attitudes. Instead, the researchers counsel:[17]

> ...Interracial contact does not have to lead to generalized attitude change in order for friendly interaction to occur. It seems likely that proximity to other-race schoolmates will lead directly, partly through the

15. Martin Patchen, James D. Davidson, Gerhard Hofmann, and William R. Brown, *Determinants of Students' Interracial Behavior and Opinion Change* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Institute for the Study of Social Change, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, June 1975), p. 19.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 27.

force of circumstances (e.g., need for a homework assignment), to friendly contact with specific individuals, perhaps with those who "seem nice." Such friendly contacts, begun almost by chance and repeated because satisfying, may then lead to more positive attitudes toward other-race people in general, as data presented elsewhere indicates.

The school can do much to provide a beneficent framework for such interaction.

In the fourth Purdue study, the principal topic is the impact of interracial experiences on students' performance, aspirations, and racial opinions.

Before entering their present high school, students reported, they had the following opinions about other-race people: [18]

		About *Whites*	About *Blacks*
Whites	Good	—	54%
	Poor	—	30%
	None	—	16%
Blacks	Good	41%	—
	Poor	29%	—
	None	30%	—

Over a period of a year, these opinions as a whole became more favorable to other-race persons. The number of blacks becoming more favorable to whites increased by 44 percent while the numbers of those whose opinions worsened grew by 15 percent. Among whites the percentages were 36 and 27. At two schools, blacks became more positive while many whites grew more negative; no explanation was offered.

Overall, opinion change was not related to the academic performance of the students involved. On the other hand, certain aspects of the educational scene were found to be relevant to cross-race evaluations. The data showed, for example, "a slight tendency for greater interracial contact to be associated with higher scores for blacks on standardized achievement tests, but also to be associated somewhat with lower school grades."[19] In addition, for both groups of students "there was a small but statistically significant tendency for greater interracial contact outside the present high school to be associated with lower grades."[20]

Academic performance for blacks was strongly related to their interest and perception of opportunities to do well in the school rather than their feelings of succeeding later in the world of work. No connection was found between the frequency of interracial contacts and aspirations of black students. This contrasts with the finding of Kurt Durig, who, in 1967, published a study of three of the Indianapolis high schools examined later by the Purdue group. He had found that blacks attending non-segregated schools and living in an integrated neighborhood had higher occupational aspirations than their peers in segregated schools. Durig atttributed the difference to an emulation by blacks of their white classmates and neighbors who occupied higher places on the occupational ladder.[21]

"....Mere mixing of the races does not necessarily produce favorable attitude change," conclude the Purdue researchers. "The key is the type of interaction which occurs."[22] A considerable contribution of their research is to have documented this

18. Martin Patchen with others, *The Relation of Inter-Racial Contact and Other Factors to Outcomes in the Public High Schools of Indianapolis* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Institute for the Study of Social Change, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, 1975), p. 2-23.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-9.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-16.
21. Kurt Robert Durig, *A Study of Social Status and Occupational Choice Among High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967), p. 95.
22. Patchen with others, *The Relation of Inter-Racial Contact*, p. 3-33.

statement. Another contribution is to have pointed to specific initiatives the school can take in order to influence the character of the interaction.

In the ETS study of some 200 desegregated schools, discussed earlier, the researchers summarized their findings on student attitudes:[23]

> In the elementary schools, racial attitudes of black and white students are reasonably similar, but white students perceive racial attitudes in the school to be more positive than do black students. In high schools, black students express racial attitudes that are more positive on the average than do white students. However, black students perceive the schools to be less fair to students and somewhat less positive in racial attitude. These results suggest that discrimination and poor race relations are more likely to be viewed as a problem by black students than by white students in both elementary and high schools.

Also, in elementary schools black and white racial attitudes were parallel. In high schools, however, racial attitudes of the two groups are unrelated to each other. It is difficult to explain the difference. In the Purdue studies, for example, racial attitudes in high schools were closely related except in one of the eleven schools. Possibly significant for the ETS schools is the fact that most elementary students had always attended non-segregated schools while the high schoolers had attended segregated elementary schools. Perhaps it takes time for young people to develop parallel attitudes.

The ETS researchers also probed into the reciprocal effects of attitudes and school practices:[24]

> Schools with good race-relations practices or racial-contact practices appear to be very open to the subject of race: to a multi-ethnic curriculum, to discussion and projects on race, and to affirmative assignments on the playground and in the classroom. The outcome from such practices appears to be good personal racial attitudes on the part of all students and better achievement for black students.

As important as racial-relations practices are, however, the researchers warn "that care must be taken to assure that they do not supplant academic values."[25]

The ETS and Purdue studies clash on a critical issue: whether SES is an important consideration in building good racial contact practices. In Indianapolis, as we saw earlier, SES was irrelevant in creating interracial friendships. The ETS investigators, however, adopt the view put forward by others that "integration would work more smoothly if black and white students of similar background were combined in a school."[26] The view is repeated that "if SES differences are not vast, it would appear that harmonious racial attitudes may come about with the passage of time."[27] Black racial attitudes in elementary schools tended to grow more negative as the black-white SES disparity grew. It would be most enlightening for other researchers to examine this difference as applied to other empirical studies of desegregation.

An unusual feature of the ETS study was the preparation of a separate report consisting of suggestions by teachers and other staff in the successfully desegregated schools. The volume summarizes the principal findings of the formal study and seeks to provide school people with specific recommendations as to "how to do it." It is a uniquely valuable volume, although every reader is likely to differ with it on one point or another.[28]

---

23. Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock, *Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation*, p. 32.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 92. 25. *Ibid.*, p. 121-22.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 173. 27. *Ibid.*, p. 178.
28. See Garlie A. Forehand and Marjorie Ragosta, *A Handbook for Integrated Schooling* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, July 1976).

Nancy St. John and Ralph Lewis studied bi-racial sixth grade classrooms in eighteen Boston schools during 1967. The sample consisted of 497 white, 411 black, and 48 other students. The researchers were interested in two questions: "Why are some children popular with classmates of another race and others not? Why are some classrooms racially cohesive and others not?"[29]

Sex was found to be more important than race in causing social cleavage in the classrooms. Academic achievement did not influence either group to like or dislike children of another race. Whites generally preferred whites while blacks preferred blacks, regardless of academic achievement. SES did not enter into the matter of student popularity, at least among black children. With white children, however, SES was a significant influence on their acceptance of both black and other white children. Interestingly, "being in a majority group situation increased interracial popularity for both groups. Whites were significantly more popular with blacks in majority white classrooms; blacks significantly more popular with whites in majority black classrooms."[30] Children who had always attended majority white schools were the most popular with their own group and, perhaps unexpectedly, tended most frequently to choose own-race friends. SES did not make a "significant contribution to the popularity of either race."[31] Racial cleavage was great in majority-white classrooms to which minority children, of lower achievement and SES, were bused. Friendships across race lines developed more rapidly when some of the minority children resided in the attendance area or exceeded the achievement and SES levels of the white children. St. John and Lewis concluded:[32]

> Our evidence suggests that cleavage can be reduced if tokenism is avoided and bused children are not isolated in classrooms of predominantly another race or of a much higher achievement level.... At the elementary level, race is less of an intrinsic barrier than many suppose. But given the visibility of race and the degree of overlap between racial and other differences, the lessons of desegregation for children may be lessons in anxiety, stereotyping, and prejudice unless teachers and principals can exert a strong countervailing influence.

In short: It depends on how it's done. (In the next section, "Desegregation and School Staff," we will review some work bearing on the significance of teachers and principals in the desegregation process.)

Five months before court-ordered desegregation was to begin in Milwaukee, the *Milwaukee Journal* sponsored a poll of student opinion of desegregation.

Black students overwhelmingly preferred to attend desegregated schools, favored busing by a margin of 2-1 (as against white students who opposed it by the same margin), supporting it by a greater margin than did black adults (68 vs. 55 percent), and seldom ranked the education they were receiving as very good. White students who had attended nonsegregated schools the longest supported desegregation the most; the higher the proportion of blacks in a school, the stronger was white support in that school for desegregation. On feelings about personal safety, the poll found: "Students in the racially integrated schools on Milwaukee's north side are not any more concerned about their personal safety than students in the predominantly white schools on the south side.... Those white students who attend integrated school districts on the north side.... also were not any more concerned about safety than the blacks in those districts."[33] Pollsters asked the question: "How do you feel

29. Nancy St. John and Ralph G. Lewis, "Race and the Social Structure of the Elementary Classroom," *Sociology of Education*, 48 (Summer 1975), p. 347.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 355. 31. *Ibid.*, p. 356. 32. *Ibid.*, p. 367.
33. "Students View Desegregation in Milwaukee," *Integrateducation*, 14 (September-October 1976), p. 47. The Social Science Research Facility at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee cooperated in conducting the survey and analyzing the results.

about the following statement: Racially mixed classes create tensions which interfere with education." Fifty-five percent of all respondents disagreed while "...62 percent of students who lived in the city areas with fully integrated schools disagreed – a level matched only by students in black schools."[34] During the first semester of desegregation which began in January 1976, strong student support for the program was evident.

During 1974 and early 1975, Charles Bullock studied twenty-eight schools in Georgia; three were all-white and one all-black. A total of 5,770 students were involved, divided almost evenly among eighth-graders, sophomores, and seniors with an overall racial composition of 58 percent white and 42 percent black. Bullock elicited statement of attitudes rather than studying behavior. All data came from responses to questionnaires. He found that "while racial tolerance seems to be generally increasing among Georgia's students, it is developing more rapidly among those who develop friendships or have school-related contacts across racial lines."[35] (This finding is highly consistent with that of the Purdue group and others.) Having even a few friends of the other race, Bullock notes, seems to make a large difference in racial attitudes. Aside from the role of contact, Bullock felt his most important finding was the almost universal lack of prejudice among all the students. Only one-seventh expressed prejudiced sentiments.

Bullock also found certain unexpected attitude differences between students in segregated and desegregated schools. One such was the greater tolerance found among students in the former type of schools. A difficulty with this part of the study is the researcher's definition of segregated and desegregated: "Segregated schools are those in which at least 99 percent of the students are of one race. All other schools are desegregated and have between 8 and 80 percent black enrollments."[36] Absolute numerical standards such as these fail to consider the racial composition of the community. A forty percent black school in a large city might very well be desegregated; in another community the same school could be known as the black school.

A final point on the Bullock study. Since it is a cross-sectional study, i.e., data were gathered only once, it cannot tell us anything about the process of desegregation. It does, however, have something to say about the attitudes of children in non-segregated schools.

Robert Wolf and Rita Simon studied a desegregation program that had operated for seven years. It involved four elementary schools and 410 students. The city was possibly Urbana, Illinois; none is named in the research report. Their research problem was: "Do children in bi-racial elementary schools interact across racial lines and develop friendships with one another?" Their principal finding is as follows: "....Children who belong to the racial category that has the majority are more often selected by members of other races, but ... such selection patterns are not reciprocal. In other words there seems to be a tendency for children to want to feel a part of the mainstream, and they will select friends on that basis."[37] This, of course, is precisely what St. John and Lewis found in their study of Boston.

Wolf and Simon go on to examine friendship choices by school attended, sex, and whether the student walked to school or was bused. In one school it was reported that "males who ride the bus together tend to select each other as friends despite racial differences."[38] In another school, however, "white males clearly select

34. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
35. Charles S. Bullock III, "Interracial Contact and Student Prejudice: The Impact of Southern Desegregation," *Youth and Society*, 7 (March 1976), p. 307.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 291.
37. Robert L. Wolf and Rita J. Simon, "Does Busing Improve the Racial Interactions of Children?" *Educational Researcher*, 4 (January 1975), pp. 9-10.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 7.

their friends on the basis of race, while black males, "tend to select white males as friends."[39] From these data alone, one might argue as Wolf and Simon do not — that busing is a more constructive basis for friendship choices than walking. Instead, they contend that "after seven years . . .friendship across race has not substantially improved." It is impossible to know how true this statement is since the researchers did not present data going back seven years.

Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (METCO), a one-way voluntary busing arrangement in Boston and its suburbs, was studied by Elizabeth Useem from the viewpoint of white students' attitudes. Data were collected during the 1968-69 school year. Blacks made up only token numbers in the eight suburban high schools studied; they ranged from 0.2 to 3.6 percent of enrollment in the schools. A total of 1,042 white students completed questionnaires.

Only 11 percent were unfavorable to METCO while 73 percent favored continuance of the program in their school; 53 percent agreed that more blacks should be assigned to their school. In general, whites of higher social status were more favorable to METCO than were students of lower status and poorer academic records. Students with some interracial contact before METCO tended to be more favorable toward the program. A significant finding was that "students of high academic and socioeconomic status who attend classes with black pupils show less favorable feelings toward METCO than similar students who have little or no such contact."[40] Useem speculates that this is because black students sometimes rebuffed patronizing efforts by the white students to strike up a friendship.

The bearing of token enterprises such at METCO for large-city desegregation is tangential, at best, observes Useem. She also cautions her fellow researchers: "Social researchers must not become mired in the misleading and legally irrelevant debate over whether integration 'works' or not, but instead should concern themselves with examining the ways in which school settings can be changed to maximize intergroup harmony."[41] Judging from the ETS study of desegregated schools, this advice was applied before it was offered. As St. John puts the matter: "The pressing need now is to discover the school conditions under which the benefits of mixed schooling are maximized and its hardships minimized."[42]

Yehuda Amir, an Israeli psychologist, has written the standard review of the literature of intergroup contact. In 1976 a revised edition of the review was published. Let us examine several of his major conclusions in the light of desegregation research, including parts of the literature reported above.

Some of the conditions that favor the reduction of prejudice, according to Amir, are:[43]

(a) equal status contact between the members of the various ethnic groups;
(b) positive perceptions of the other group as a result of the contact (even under unequal status conditions);
(c) contact between members of a majority and *higher* status members of a minority group;
(d) contact situation requiring intergroup cooperation;

---

39. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
40. Elizabeth Useem, "Correlates of White Students' Attitudes Toward a Voluntary Busing Program," *Education and Urban Society*, 8 (August 1976), p. 460.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 470.
42. Nancy H. St. John, *School Desegregation Outcomes for Children* (New York: Wiley, 1975), p. 122.
43. Yehuda Amir, "The Role of Intergroup Contact in Change of Prejudice and Ethnic Relations," in Phyllis A. Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism* (New York: Pergamon, 1976), p. 288.

(e) contact situation involving interdependent activities, superordinate goals, or separate aims that can be achieved only by intergroup cooperation;

(f) contact of an intimate rather than a casual nature;

(g) an "authority" and/or social climate being in favor of and promoting the intergroup contact; and

(h) contact that is pleasant or rewarding.

The issue of equal status is involved in his first three sub-points. As the Purdue group found, relative status did not play a role in friendship choices; nor did it play an unambiguous role in the study by St. John and Lewis. Amir's (b) seems most in keeping with these and other earlier studies. Subpoint (d) and (e) are strongly supported by desegregation literature. Subpoint (g), which highlights the role of leadership of an "official" character, is confirmed sweepingly in desegregation case studies. Stated as it is, subpoint (h) is unexceptionable. On the other hand, over a period of time, unpleasant and unrewarding contacts can be changed. As the ETS researchers found: "Some of the schools that have been most successful in promoting positive racial interactions have done so by confronting and overcoming serious racial disorders."[44]

Amir stresses the instrumental character of desegregation:[45]

> A frequently stated fundamental goal of contemporary western society is equal opportunity for all. Until this is established, racial desegregation is essential because evidence clearly indicates that services and opportunities within segregated groups of unequal status will always be unequal. Desegregation has, on the other hand, increased the availability of adequate services and facilities for low-status groups. Thus, unless "togetherness" is fostered, the principle of equal opportunities will turn out to be mere lip service.

He repeats several times that ethnic contact must become a way of life and must be practiced in spheres other than school.

---

44. Forehand and Ragosta, *A Handbook for Integrated Schooling*, p. 5.
45. Amir, "The Role of Intergroup Contact," p. 293.

DESEGREGATION AND THE SCHOOL STAFF

"Although it's hard to believe," wrote Orfield in 1974, "almost all of the existing research on desegregation ignores the roles of teachers and principals in schools in making desegregation work or not."[1] In part, the failing reflects a characteristic of much educational research. Programs are described, numbers are counted, tests are given, and outcomes are delineated. Frequently missing is an analytical account of the human interactions that intervened between outset and conclusion. Attention to the roles of school boards and superintendents has also been missing from much research on desegregation. To ignore these persons is to proclaim the irrelevance of the overall framework of cooperation or grudging approval or even resistance that determines in large part the success of efforts in classrooms.

Harrell Rodgers and Charles Bullock studied the impact of school desegregation on school officials in thirty-one Georgia school districts which had desegregated by 1970. These officials included 130 whites and 39 blacks occupying positions as board members, superintendents, board attorneys, principals, and assistant principals. They were interviewed between June 1973 and May 1974.

Sixty-two percent of the white officials still expressed opposition to desegregation while ninety percent of blacks favored it. When asked whether desegregation had helped race relations in their schools, forty percent of the whites and seventy-nine percent of the blacks said yes. On future trends, Rodgers and Bullock were modest in their expectations:[2]

> We infer from the persisting white opposition to desegregation that Georgia officials will unilaterally do little to correct "second generation desegregation problems." The lingering preferences of some white officials for segregation are manifested in discriminatory discipline and ability grouping policies, and in the anti-black personnel policies found in some of our districts.

At the same time they report that "school desegregation seems to have produced a sizable number of white converts even in these recalcitrant districts."[3]

Further, "if continuing efforts are made to eliminate racism in these districts," conclude Rodgers and Bullock, "the long term result should be quite positive. The changes that have occurred in white officials' attitudes are fairly impressive and the finding that forty percent of the [white] officials felt that desegregation has led to improved race relations is particularly heartening."[4]

Eugene Mornell studied seven members of three local school boards in California which implemented desegregation in 1970, two by court order and one voluntarily. He spent a total of 2,000 hours as a participant observer. Five of the seven members had originally opposed desegregation and Mornell sought to understand their change of mind.

The role of the superintendent in effecting change in these districts was less salient than might have been imagined:[5]

> Ultimately it seems likely that the superintendent may be relatively more influential, given his own doubts, problems, or opposition, in slowing or preventing desegregation than in speeding or forcing it.

---

1. Gary Orfield, "Examining the Desegregation Process," *Integrateducation* 13 (May-June 1975), p. 127.
2. Harrell R. Rodgers, Jr. and Charles S. Bullock III, "The Impact of School Desegregation," *Integrateducation*, 14 (March-April 1976), p. 34.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. Eugene S. Mornell, "School Board Members and Desegregation," *Integrateducation*, 13 (March-April 1975), p. 21.

Since Martha Turnage wrote the first extended treatment of the principal's role in desegregation in 1972,[6] researchers have increased their attention to the subject.

"The principal is the most important person in successful integration." according to the ETS study of desegregated schools. "In relationships with both students and faculty, the principal is the most effective and visible modeler and facilitator of good race relations."[7] Another finding from the ETS study is relevant at this point: High schools that have good race relations tend to have principals that are evaluated highly by teachers.[8] The relationship between principal and teacher is discussed below.

In the ESAA evaluation study, the role of the principal is prominent. "Minorities," for example, "saw themselves as being treated less favorably by their principals and vice-principals than non-minority students saw themselves as being treated."[9] High school principals were more interested — perhaps because they were more frequently confronted by problems — in holding discussion meetings with staff and community on desegregation problems. In these same desegregated schools, over 80 percent of the principals had not received memoranda from the central office dealing with desegregation activities.

The in-depth ESAA study of twenty-four desegregated elementary schools found that "schools that were successful in raising math achievement were characterized by administrative leadership in instruction."[10] In schools whose principals emphasized social goals — concerning benevolent social interaction among students — "student intergroup mixing during recess and lunch was more likely to be observed" and teachers "were less likely to display a disproportionately high amount of negative behavior to minority students."[11] Thus, the principal was of direct importance to academic and human relations achievement in the schools.

Principals and other administrators come in several colors, but few are black.

In Los Angeles, Don Wilson interviewed 94 of the 138 black administrators in the public school system. Schools with a black enrollment of from 70 to 100 percent employed over 85 percent of such administrators. They contended they were all but barred from predominantly white schools and felt as a group that "they should have the opportunity to be assigned outside the central city if they elected to do so."[12] Most believed "it was almost impossible for a black candidate to receive an administrative assignment outside of the central city."[13] Wilson further reported that ". . . . only 15 percent . . . . thought that the examination process offered equal opportunities for black . . . . administrative candidates, and only six percent believed that the assignment procedure provided equal opportunities for black administrators."[14]

Gail Fullington studied the problems of black assistant principals in an urban desegregated system. "He is dependent upon his white superior," she writes, "for both his successes and his failures."[15] He initiates little and spends much of his time heading up affirmative action and human relations groups. Maintaining discipline is a major part of his assignment. However, "often problems concerning

---

6. Martha Turnage, *The Principal: Change-Agent in Desegregation* (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1972).
7. Forehand and Ragosta, *A Handbook for Integrated Schooling*, p. 13.
8. Forehand, Ragosta, and Rock, *Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation*, p.v.
9. Coulson and others, *The Second Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation*, p. IV-19.
10. Wellisch and others, *An In-Depth Study*, p. III-21.
11. *Ibid.*, p. VII-14.
12. Don Wilson, "Attitudes of Black Administrators in Los Angeles," *Integrateducation*, 13 (July-August 1975), p. 43.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Gail Fullington, "Soul Brother or Uncle Tom?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 57 (March 1976), p. 467.

white students are referred to the white administrator, and problems concerning black students are referred to the black assistant (principal)."[16] Fullington comments on the demoralizing effect of such tokenism: "No one is fooled by tokenism — least of all the students. And seeing members of their race continually put in such positions by whites destroys any hope for the future."[17]

One of the newest and most rewarding areas of desegregation research is the role of the teacher. While the research is overdue, there is a danger that grave distortion may flow from it. Since in most cases teachers are employed in large organizations, the teachers are a "captive" audience for the researchers. School boards, superintendents, and principals do not traditionally welcome critical studies of their own roles; it is much easier to direct the researchers to a study of teachers' roles. If, however, the resulting research findings are accepted without reference to the values and practices of those who manage and direct the entire enterprise, a partial picture will emerge. Unfortunately, this seems more or less to be the current situation. Trying to change an entire organization by altering the behavior of only one part seems rather fruitless.

Nevertheless, the classroom remains the prime scene of school learning and the classroom teacher a critical element on that scene. Let us examine some recent evidence bearing on her or his roles in desegregation.

In the Purdue studies of non-segregated schools, teachers were found to be of considerable educational importance. The more favorable the students' evaluation of their teacher the greater academic effort they reported. This was true of both black and white students. Curiously, however, the more social favoritism black students perceived on the part of teachers, the *harder* they studied. Perhaps this was an effort attuned realistically to overcoming a special barrier. The researchers emphasize:[18]

> . . . .Even when we adjust for the effects of a large number of home background factors, personal student characteristics, and other aspects of the school situation, the relationship between teacher and student still emerges as an important contributor to the students' effort and academic success. This result suggests the importance of continued, and perhaps increased, attention to building positive bonds between student and teacher, as a prerequisite to improving academic performance.

Along with nearly every other study of the subject, the Purdue research reports negative and positive aspects of the teacher's role. Unfortunately, in-classroom observation of teachers' behavior was not part of the systematic study.

In the ESAA in-depth study the role of teachers figured prominently. Desegregated elementary schools in which teachers were especially negative in their behavior toward minority students tended to register lesser reading achievement gains.

In a somewhat unique effort, teachers in twenty-four schools were asked how important teacher-competency was in relation to student motivation. The teachers were unanimous in rejecting the idea the student motivation was clearly less important than teaching competence. In half the schools, teachers seemed ready to claim a major responsibility for learning on the part of better-motivated students. In eight more schools, teachers ranked both factors as equal. "In two schools," write the researchers, "teachers appeared to reject clearly their own role in instruction.[19]

---

16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. Patchen and others, *The Relation of Interracial Contact*, p. 3-41.
19. Wellisch and others, *An In-Depth Study*, p. V-10.

Teachers in two more gave their own competency a slight edge. Teacher expectations for their students were found to be high in sixteen high achievement schools, and low in the others.

Teachers in the same schools were asked how they would explain academic failure among their students. (Most students came from poor families and scored in the lowest quartile on national achievement tests.) Six factors were listed: low income, family problems, inadequate ability of student, lack of student motivation, inadequate materials, and inadequate teacher. They responded as follows: "Teachers in ten schools believed that inadequate teachers were about as important as the other factors in contributing to academic failure.... In the remaining fourteen schools, teachers considered their own role somewhat less important."[20] On the whole, responses to this question elicited more critical sentiments than those reported in the preceding paragraph.

Student gains in reading were *less* likely in schools whose teachers praised students frequently. The researchers explained this apparently anomalous finding in terms of teachers offering the praise on a non-selective basis. Students of these teachers were praised as a matter of routine under the mistaken theory that empty praise is beneficial as motivation for genuine achievement. Other researchers have noted the negative consequences of such "praise."[21] In the ESAA in-depth schools, "teachers who were observed praising students less were also observed providing more practice time."[22]

Celestino Fernández and associates found a similar mechanism at work in eight San Francisco high schools. Mexican American and black students, low in academic achievement, received much praise from their teachers who related warmly with the students. "...Receiving praise for work that is not very creditable," the researchers write, "leads to distorted images of the level of effort and achievement each student believes he or she is putting forth.[23] Over a period of time, such patterns come to buttress "educational and occupational stratification." Few educational researchers have dealt at length with this problem of the school employing low educational standards for poor and minority children. It is to the credit of the ESAA evaluators and Fernández and associates that they have done so.

To return to the ESAA in-depth analysis, researchers found the existence of racial bias among teachers at five of sixteen desegregated schools. For one thing these teachers were extremely negative in their relations with minority children. In the same proportion of schools, there seemed to be racial bias in student seating arrangements in classrooms, and in a reluctance to use multi-ethnic teaching materials.[24] Teacher bias tended to lessen the reading achievement of minority children. In a number of ESAA high schools, those students tended to feel less alienated "whose teachers had expressed more positive attitudes toward integration and desegregation."[25]

---

20. *Ibid.*
21. See, for example, Robert L. Byalick, *Expressed Preference and Observed Use of Positive Reinforcement in Biracial Classrooms* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972), p. 63.
22. Wellisch and others, *An In-Depth Study*, p. V-19.
23. Celestino Fernández, Rubén W. Espinosa, and Sanford M. Dornbusch, *Factors Perpetuating the Low Academic Status of Chicano High School Students* (Stanford, California: School of Education, Stanford University, July 1975), p. 33.
24. Wellisch and others, *An In-Depth Study*, p. VII-14.
25. Coulson and others, *The Second Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation*, p. X-18.

WORKS CITED

Amir, Yehuda. "The Role of Intergroup Contact in Change of Prejudice and Ethnic Relations," in Phyllis A. Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism* (New York: Pergamon, 1976).

Armor, David and others. *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools* (Santa Monica, California: Rand, August 1976).

Berlin, Ira. *Slaves Without Masters. The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York: Pantheon, 1974).

Boardman, Anthony E.; Davis, Otto A.; and Sanday, Peggy R. *A Simultaneous Equations Model of the Educational Process: The Coleman Data With An Emphasis Upon Achievement in 1973 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association*, Social Statistics Section.

Bridgeman, Brent, and Shipman, Virginia C. with others. *Predictive Value of Measures of Self-Esteem and Achievement Motivation in Four- to Nine-Year Old Low-Income Children* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, November 1975).

Bullock, Charles S., III. "Interracial Contact and Student Prejudice. The Impact of Southern Desegregation," *Youth and Society*, 7 (March 1976).

Byalick, Robert L. *Expressed Preference and Observed Use of Positive Reinforcement in Birracial Classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972).

Coulson, John E. and others. *The First Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation* (Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, September 15, 1975).

———. *The Second Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation* (Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, July 1976).

Cronbach, Lee J. "Five Decades of Public Controversy Over Mental Testing," *American Psychologist*, 30 (1975).

Davey, Alfred G. "The Growth of Prejudice in Young Children," *Patterns of Prejudice*, 8 (May-June 1974).

Durig, Kurt Robert. *A Study of Social Status and Occupational Choice Among High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967).

Emmerich, Walter. *Preschool Personal-Social Behaviors: Relationships with Socioeconomic Status, Cognitive Skills, and Tempo* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, August 1973).

Epstein, Yakov M.; Krupat, Edward; and Obudho, Constance. "Clean Is Beautiful: Identification and Preference as a Function of Race and Cleanliness," *Journal of Social Issues*, 32, No. 2 (1976).

Fay, J. Michael, *Community Resources in School Finance as Related to Equality of Educational Opportunity in Metropolitan School System* (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974) (University Microfilms Order No. 75-11, 480).

———. "Private Resources: Another Road to Inequality," *Integrateducation*, 14, (January-February 1976).

Fernández, Celestino; Espinosa, Rubén W.; and Dornbusch, Stanford M. *Factors Perpetuating the Low Academic Status of Chicano High School Students* (Stanford, California: School of Education, Stanford University, July 1975).

Feuerstein, in Lee Cronbach and P.J.D. Drenth (eds.), *Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation* (The Hague: Mouton, 1972).

Forehand, Garlie A., and Ragosta, Marjorie. *A Handbook for Integrated Schooling* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, July 1976).

Forehand, Garlie A.; Ragosta, Marjorie; and Rock, Donald A. *Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, July 1976).

Fullington, Gail. "Soul Brother or Uncle Tom?," *Phi Delta Kappa*, 57 (March 1976).

Gilbert, Lynn, and Shipman, Virginia C. "Preschool Inventory," in Virginia C. Shipman (ed.), *Technical Report Series* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Services, December 1972).

Henderson, Vivian W. "Race, Economics, and Public Policy," *Integrateducation*, 14 (January-February 1976).

Hofmann, Gerhard; Patchen, Martin; and Davidson, James D. *Social Determinants of Friendship Relations Between Black and White Adolescents* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, 1975).

Jencks, Christopher, and Brown, Marsha. "The Effects of Desegregation on Student Achievement: Some New Evidence From the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey," *Sociology of Education*, 48 (Winter 1975).

Jencks, Christopher with Smith, Marshall; Acland, Henry; Bane, Mary Jo; Cohen, David; Gintis, Herbert; Heyns, Barbara; and Michelson, Stephan. *Inequality* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).

Katz, Phyllis A. "Attitude Change in Children: Can the Twig Be Straightened?" in Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, (New York: Pergamon, 1976).

———. "The Acquisition of Racial Attitudes in Children," in Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism* (New York: Pergamon, 1976).

Loehlin, John C.; Lindzey, Gardner; and Spuhler, J. N. *Race Differences in Intelligence* (San Francisco: Freeman, 1975).

Luecke, Daniel F., and McGinn, Noel F. "Regression Analyses and Education Production Functions: Can They Be Trusted?" *Harvard Educational Review*, 45 (August 1975).

Mandel, Allan S. *Resource Distribution Inside School Districts* (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1975).

———. "Resource Distribution Within School Districts," *Integrateducation*, 14 (January-February 1976).

Marx, Ronald W. and Winne, Philip H. "Self-Concept and Achievement: Implications for Educational Programs," *Integrateducation*, 13 (January-February 1975).

Mornell, Eugene S. "School Board Members and Desegregation," *Integrateducation*, 13 (March-April 1975).

National Assessment of Educational Progress. *Science Achievement: Racial and Regional Trends, 1969-73* (Denver: Education Commission of the States, March 1976).

Orfield, Gary. "Examining the Desegregation Process," *Integrateducation*, 13 (May-June 1975).

———. "Will Separate Be More Equal?" *Integrateducation*, 14 (January-February 1976).

Patchen, Martin; Davidson, James D.; and Hofmann, Gerhard. *"Inter-Racial Perceptions Among High School Students* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, May 1974).

Patchen, Martin; Davidson, James D.; Hofmann, Gerhard; and Brown, William R. *Determinants of Students' Interracial Behavior and Opinion Change* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Institute for the Study of Social Change, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, June 1975).

———. *The Relation of Inter-Racial Contact and Other Factors to Outcomes in the Public High Schools of Indianapolis* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Institute for the Study of Social Change, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, 1975).

Payne, Joseph F. "Race, Reading, and Poverty in Los Angeles," *Intergrateducation*, 9 (November-December 1971).

Preliminary Description of the Initial Sample Prior to School Enrollment, vol. 1 (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, August 1970).

Poussaint, Alvin. "New Values Challenge Old Assumptions." *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin*, 7 (1976).

Rodgers, Harrell R., Jr., and Bullock, Charles S., III. "The Impact of School Desegregation," *Integrateducation*, 14 (March-April 1976).

Rowan, Carl T. "Cheers! Blacks Are Not Inferior After All," *Chicago Daily News*, February 28, 1976.

St. John, Nancy H. *School Desegregation Outcomes for Children* (New York: Wiley, 1975).

———and Lewis, Ralph G. "Race and the Social Structure of the Elementary Classroom," *Sociology of Education*, 48 (Summer 1975).

Shipman, Virginia C. and others. *Structure and Development of Cognitive Competencies and Styles Prior to School Entry* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, December 1971).

"Students View Desegregation in Milwaukee," *Integrateducation*, 14 (September-October 1976).

Summers, Anita A., and Wolfe, Barbara L. *Equality of Educational Opportunity Quantified: A Production Function Approach* (Philadelphia: Department of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 1975).

———. *Intradistrict Distribution of School Resources to the Disadvantaged: Evidence for the Courts* (Philadelphia: Department of Research, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 1975).

Tizard, Jack. "Race and IQ: The Limits of Probability," *New Community*, 4 (Autumn 1975).

Turnage, Martha. *The Principal: Change-Agent in Desegregation* (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1972).

Tyack, David B. *The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974).

Useem, Elizabeth. "Correlates of White Students' Attitudes Toward a Voluntary Busing Program," *Education and Urban Society*, 8 (August 1976).

Vaughn, William Preston. *Schools for All. The Blacks and Public Education in the South, 1865-1877* (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1974).

Wallace, Bruce. "Genetics and the Great IQ Controversy," *American Biology Teacher*, 37 (January 1975).

Ward, William C. *Development of Self-Regulatory Behaviors* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, May 1973).

Wellisch, Jean B. and others. *An In-Depth Study of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Schools: 1974-1975* (Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, July 1976).

Wilson, Don. "Attitudes of Black Administrators in Los Angeles," *Integrateducation*, 13 (July-August 1975).

Wise, Arthur, and Lindquist, Robert. "Developments in Education Litigation: Equal Protection," *Journal of Law and Education*, 5 (1976).

Wolf, Robert L., and Simon, Rita J. "Does Busing Improve the Racial Interactions of Children?" *Educational Researcher*, 4 (January 1975).

Woodson, Carter G. *The African Background Outlined Or Handbook for the Study of the Negro* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968; orig., 1936).